L. LXV.

19/a

ANSWERS

TO ALL THE OBJECTIONS

HITHERTO MADE AGAINST

COW-POX.

BY JOSEPH ADAMS, M.D.

Physician to the Small-pox and Inoculation Hospitals, and Author of "Observations on Morbid Poisons," &c.

THE SECOND EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.

The Profits of this Tract will be given to the Small-pox and Inoculation Hospitals.

LONDON:

Printed by R. Wilks, 89, Chancery-Lane;

AND SOLD BY J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD; J. MURRAY, FLEET-STREET; AND AT THE SMALL-POX AND INOCULATION HOSPITALS, PANCRAS.

1805.

[*Price* 1*s.* 6*d.*

91896

WELLCOME
HISTORICAL
MEDICAL
LIBRARY

TO HIS GRACE

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD,

&c. &c. &c.

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE SMALL-POX AND INOCULATION HOSPITALS,

AND PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL JENNERIAN INSTITUTION,

THE SECOND EDITION OF THIS LITTLE TRACT

IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY HIS GRACE'S

FAITHFUL AND MUCH OBLIGED

HUMBLE SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

Berners-Street, Nov. 15, 1805.

TO THE PEOPLE

OF THAT PART OF THE UNITED KINGDOMS

CALLED

ENGLAND.

As the Cow-pox Inoculation has now been practiſed for more than ſeven years, and as the nobility, and moſt of the gentry, in this and all foreign parts, vaccinate their children, it ſeems a matter of wonder that it ſhould be neceſſary to ſay any thing in its favour. Still there are people who for want of better information make objections, and as theſe, without doubt, intend the beſt for their children, I have thought it worth while to take ſome pains in examining all that has been ſaid againſt it. But, firſt, it ſeems very remarkable that theſe objections ſhould only be known in England. Though vaccination is ſpread through France *, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Germany, Pruſſia,

* The last report from Paris says, that Cow-pox has been found a security against Small-pox as certain as it is mild. That more than a hundred thousand persons have been vaccinated without a single fact occurring that could shake the Public confidence.—*Chaptal's Letter to the Minister of the Interior.*

Ruſſia, and every other part of Europe; through the Eaſt Indies, and moſt other parts of Aſia; through Africa, and not only that part of America which is inhabited by the deſcendants of Europeans, but among the Indian ſavages: ſtill we hear of no objections to the practice but in England! England, that ought to boaſt the honour of the invention! England that may proudly ſay to France, 'If you think us not a match for you, ſingle-handed, in killing, at leaſt we will be your ſuperiors in the art of ſaving life!'

Some people may fancy, that becauſe the practice begun among us, therefore it has been more general, and in conſequence more accidents have happened; but this is far from the caſe; for the practice has been univerſal in other countries, and only partial in this. In the Eaſt Indies, the Prieſts, who lead the ignorant multitude, uſed to inoculate for Small-pox; they were therefore fearful of loſing their conſequence by the introduction of a better plan. However, the people finding that all the Engliſh children fared ſo well under the Cow-pox, determined, in a matter that concerned them ſo nearly, to judge for themſelves, and then the Prieſts, or Bramins as they are called in that country, were obliged to do the ſame. But they could not bear to learn any thing of this kind from another nation.—They therefore pretended to find ſomething about the Cow-pox in their own books, and the people not

caring much about the matter, as long as they poſſeſſed this bleſſing, never gave themſelves the trouble of aſking whence it came. The Engliſh alſo were too prudent to contradict them, though they well knew that there was no Cow-pox in the country but what was derived from ſome ſent by Dr. Jenner, by way of Germany. Since that time it has been ſpread through all the Eaſt Indies, and Small-pox Inoculation is nearly at an end.

In America, Small-pox has been generally a very fatal diſeaſe. It is well known that bad caſes ſometimes occur from Inoculation in England. In America they were much more frequent, ſo that for this and ſome other reaſons it was not ſo generally practiſed as in many parts of the world. But the extraordinary ſucceſs of Cow-pox has obviated all difficulties, and all the objections they hear of from this country only excite their aſtoniſhment inſtead of altering their practice. France, I am concerned to ſay, only make uſe of this opportunity to laugh at us, and to ſay how eaſily we are deceived; and I ſuppoſe the Iriſh will ſay, "How eaſy it is to cheat the Engliſh, who are always laughing at our blunders,"—for in Ireland they go on vaccinating, though they read and hear all that is written and ſpoken againſt it in this country.

How comes it, then, that England, who ſhould be ſo proud of the diſcovery, and of her ſon, Jenner, who

made it, is the only nation that ſpeaks evil of this bleſſing. I know there are people who impute this to jealouſy, and ſay that as an Engliſhman made the diſcovery, Engliſhmen cannot bear to ſee one of themſelves raiſed ſo much above them. But for my part I am willing to think better of my countrymen. However, it muſt be confeſſed that Engliſhmen are but men; and it is poſſible that ſome people of this deſcription may have written books which may have rendered others uneaſy; for as it is commonly ſaid, evil reports fly very faſt, and very few have leiſure to inquire into the truth of them; and when we recollect how many poor creatures were formerly burnt for witchcraft, we cannot wonder if, even in theſe days, when we are wiſer in thoſe reſpects, ſome of us ſhould ſtill be ſhy of what is at preſent new. Beſide which, thoſe who love their children (and the Engliſh ought to do more for their preſervation than other nations, becauſe they inherit more bleſſings) are of courſe anxious that they ſhould be perfectly ſafe from ſo dangerous a diſeaſe, and they have been long enough acquainted with Small-pox Inoculation to know its ſecurity.

Thus you ſee I am ready to make large allowances for the different opinions of different people, and, to give a further proof of this, have paid great attention to all the objections that have been made againſt Vac-

cination, which I ſhall endeavour to anſwer in a manner I hope ſatisfactory to all. But it is worth remarking, how much they reſemble thoſe which were made againſt the firſt introduction of Inoculation for Small-pox in the year 1721, of which my late ingenious and candid friend, Dr. Woodville, has given the following account:—

"The moſt redoubted champion (ſays he *) who at this time appealed to the public againſt inoculation, was Dr. Wagſtaffe, a man of extenſive profeſſional practice; and as a Fellow of the College, and Phyſician to St. Bartholomew's Hoſpital, he could not fail to influence the minds of many to a conſiderable degree; more eſpecially as his "*Letter ſhewing the danger and uncertainty of inoculating the Small-pox*," was addreſſed to the learned Dr. Friend. In this letter Dr. Wagſtaffe takes a very comprehenſive view of the ſubject; and as he concludes with a recapitulation of his objections to inoculation, I am thereby enabled to give them as ſtated by himſelf.—"Now, ſir, I have recounted, I believe, moſt of the inconveniencies ariſing from this experiment; I have obſerved that it may differ from itſelf as practiſed in another climate; that it is not agreeable to reaſon,

* See Doctor Woodville's History of Inoculation.—It is but justice to remark, that the reading of Mr. Merriman's valuable Observations on Vaccine Inoculation, first suggested these Extracts.

that the poſitions of the favourers of Inoculation are falſe, and their practices as precarious; that ſome have had the diſtemper not at all, others to a ſmall degree, others the worſt ſort, and that ſome have died of it. I have given inſtances of thoſe who have had it after inoculation in the common way, and conſequently as it is hazardous, ſo it will neither anſwer the main deſign of preventing the diſtemper for the future. I have conſidered what the effects may be of inoculating on an ill habit of body, and how deſtructive it may prove to ſpread a diſtemper that is contagious; and how widely at length the authors in this ſubject diſagree among themſelves, and how little they have ſeen of the practice: all which ſeem to be juſt and neceſſary conſequences of theſe new-fangled notions, as well as convincing reaſons for the diſuſe of the practice."

"One of the rumours ſpread (continues Dr. Woodville) with a view to prejudice the public against inoculation was, that this art ſeldom produced the genuine Small-pox, and therefore would not ſecure the inoculated from the effects of variolous infection in the natural way. Mr. Tanner, at that time ſurgeon to St. Thomas's Hoſpital, declared that he inoculated a perſon who had undergone the caſual Small-pox ſeveral years before, and the effect of the operation was a diſcharge from the inciſions and irregular eruptions; appearances which the inoculators, in the experiments at Newgate,

had deemed ſufficient to prevent the patients having the Small pox in future *."

After this ſeveral ſuppoſed caſes are enumerated of the appearance of the Small-pox after inoculation, ſome of which proved to have been Chicken-pox, others uncertain eruptions, the nature of which cannot now be aſcertained.

Dr. Woodville, in ſumming up the reſult of inoculation for the firſt three years, concludes thus: "Hence we find, that of the 474 perſons firſt inoculated in England, nine died, and their deaths were ſuſpected to have happened in conſequence of inoculation. Three of theſe unfortunate caſes, which occurred in the year 1722, I have already related; the remaining ſix, which happened in the year 1723, are now to be noticed."

"Miſs Rolt, aged between nine and ten years, and a boy about three years old, were inoculated by Serjeant Surgeon Amyand, in London, both with the ſame matter, September 25th, 1723. They both began to ſicken on the eighth day from inoculation; and on the tenth the Small-pox appeared, of the diſtinct kind, on both. The boy recovered: but Mr. Maitland ſays, "Miſs Rolt, the day before the eruption, complained

* This caſe ſhews the unfair advantage which has been taken of the few inſtances in which ſimilar ſlight eruptions have appeared in ſuch as have been inoculated with Small-pox after vaccination.

of great pains in her ſhoulders, elbows, and knees; and the fever continuing, the Small-pox fluxed upon her the third day from the eruption. Sir Hans Sloane and Dr. Arbuthnot attended her. She went through the diſtemper with eaſe; the Small-pox began to turn on her on the ſeventh day; but were not dried all over till the fourteenth. The fever that aroſe then occaſioned her being blooded, and ſoon after ſeveral tumours appeared in the neighbourhood of ſeveral joints, which were opened. The fever continued, and more ſuppurated tumours were daily appearing, which were diſcharged as ſoon as poſſible. Sometimes ſhe was troubled with a diarrhœa, whereby, as well as by the ſuppuration of twenty or thirty boils that were opened, ſhe was ſpent, ſo that ſhe died the 27th of November following; that is, nine weeks after inoculation."

It would be tedious to enumerate the other caſes. I have choſen this as enough for my purpoſe, to ſhew that the apprehenſion of humours (though we ſhall preſently see they were erroneouſly aſcribed to inoculation) was built on a more plauſible foundation than any that has been produced in ſupport of the ſame objection againſt vaccination.

But it will be ſaid,—What are a few boils, and even the death of the patient, compared with all the horrid ſtories we hear againſt vaccination? Certainly theſe

laſt are very terrible things. But the devil being the moſt terrible thing in nature, it was thought by the early objectors to inoculation ſufficient to bring him forward, and after his agency in a bad buſineſs was well eſtabliſhed, it was unneceſſary to ſay more.

"The Rev. Mr. Maſſey, in a ſermon, preached at St. Andrew's, Holborn*, againſt the dangerous and ſinful practice of inoculation, treated the inoculators with the moſt unqualified abuſe, calling them diabolical ſorcerers, helliſh venefici, enemies of mankind, and hoped they would be diſtinguiſhed from thoſe of the faculty who deſerve honour, and not be permitted to mingle with them, as the devil among the ſons of God. He conſiders inoculation as a very ancient art, and firſt put in practice upon Job by the "devil, who, by ſome venemous infuſion into the body of Job, might raiſe his blood to ſuch a ferment, as threw out a confluence of inflammatory puſtules all over him from head to foot; that is, his diſtemper might be what is now incident to moſt men, and perhaps conveyed to him by ſome ſuch way as that of inoculation." Thus we are to underſtand, that the devil was the firſt in-

* On Sunday, July 8th, 1722. His text was: "So went Satan forth from the preſence of the Lord, and ſmote Job with ſore boils, from the ſole of his foot unto his crown." Chap. xi. ver. 18.

oculator, and poor Job his firſt patient *. Hence he terms inoculation "a diabolical operation, and an anti-providential project, that inſults our religion, and baniſhes Providence out of the world.'

This reverend gentleman was diſpoſed to be civil to the faculty at leaſt; but another writer thought we ought to be ranked with the father of lies.

"He declares (ſays Dr. Woodville) this new practice to be founded in atheiſm, quackery, and avarice, which, to uſe the author's words, "puſh men to all the helliſh practices imaginable: men murder fathers, mothers, relations, and innocent children, and any that ſtand in the way of their wicked deſires." He adds, "While this helliſh principle has ſo much hold upon mankind, it is highly neceſſary that there ſhould be no doors left open for the practice, at leaſt none that can be ſhut; that there ſhould be no room for the covering of ſuch horrid things from the reach of the law. Phyſicians have already too much latitude in practice to make havoc of mankind for the ſatisfaction of their judgment in phyſic, and increaſe

* This conceit of the Rev. Divine gave riſe to the following epigram, published in the Monthly Miſcellany for March 1774.

We're told, by one of the black robe,
The Devil inoculated *Job*;
Suppoſe 'tis true what he doth tell,
Pray, neighbours, did not *Job do well*?

of their experience; but every quack now may be a hireling to the devil, and, like that banditti in Italy, be ready to do the drudgery of removing heirs, and other obſtructing incumbents of many kinds; and to do this under the maſk of a cure, inoculating death inſtead of a diſeaſe, and making uſe of an art never before practiſed, in a manner not foreſeen, and by the laws not yet ſufficiently guarded againſt."

It cannot be doubted, that theſe dreadful threatenings muſt have had conſiderable influence on the minds of parents. Many who were even ſenſible that ſome of the objections were falſe, were ſtill apprehenſive that ſuch ſtrong language could not be uſed without ſome real cauſe; accordingly we find that in the year 1724, the third after the introduction of the practice, only forty perſons were inoculated. It will be preſumed that many anſwers appeared to all theſe objections; but ſtill the apprehenſions of the timid, who are ſometimes among the beſt intentioned part of ſociety, had their effect. Few people ſee enough of the world to enable them to judge impartially of contradictory evidence; and whilſt the mind is thus kept in ſuſpenſe, it liſtens eagerly to every ſuggeſtion which ſtrengthens its doubts, and ſerves as an excuſe for its want of deciſion. There is, however, a claſs of mankind, whoſe hourly intercourſe with the world enables them to form the moſt correct judgment of characters, and whoſe ele-

vated rank furniſhes them with all the information they wiſh for.

"When Sir Hans Sloane, at that time the firſt phyſician in Europe, was conſulted by George the Firſt, relative to the inoculation of the two princeſſes his grand-children, he told his Majeſty—it was impoſſible to be certain but that on raiſing ſuch a commotion in the blood, there might happen dangerous accidents not foreſeen. To this the king replied—that ſuch might and had happened to perſons, who had loſt their lives by bleeding in a pleuriſy, and taking phyſic in any diſtemper, let ever ſo much care be taken. In this opinion Sir Hans coincided with his Majeſty, and the two princeſſes were inoculated."

This conduct, ſo worthy of one celebrated for the goodneſs of his diſpoſition, and the ſoundneſs of his judgment, one ſhould have expected would have had a proper effect: but neither example nor argument had any influence on Dr. Wagſtaffe; whoſe remark on the occaſion was, "Poſterity will ſcarcely be brought to believe, that an experiment, practiſed only by a few ignorant women, ſhould ſo far obtain in one of the politeſt nations in the world, as to be received into the royal palace." However the Doctor had ſoon afterwards the mortification to find it introduced a ſecond time into the royal family; for their Royal Highneſſes Prince Frederick and Prince William were both inoculated this ſame year.

Yet with all this encouragement the progreſs of inoculation was in thoſe days incredibly ſlow, compared with vaccination in our own. The numbers vaccinated and inoculated at the Small-pox Hoſpital alone, within theſe laſt *eight months*, exceeds the whole that were inoculated during *fourteen years* after the firſt introduction of that practice. There was indeed one objection againſt Small-pox Inoculation, which was too well founded. The firſt projectors flattered themſelves that the diſeaſe given in this way would not prove infectious to others, excepting by inoculation. In this they ſoon found themſelves miſtaken. But this cannot be urged againſt vaccination, which it is now our buſineſs to conſider: and the only objections that I have heard againſt which are,

Firſt, That it is no ſecurity at all againſt the Small-pox. Secondly, That it is only a ſecurity for a time. And, thirdly, That it introduces humours into the conſtitution.

The firſt objection has now almoſt died away; the evidence to the contrary is ſo ſtrong, that no reaſonable people will any longer attempt to maintain it.

That it is only a ſecurity for a time, has been urged by a very well-intentioned author. But the beſt of people are liable to errors, and very few are ready to acknowledge them. However, the moſt reſpectable among thoſe who maintain this opinion, is now led to

believe, that if a perſon is vaccinated in the hand he may be ſecure from the Small-pox for life; but if in the arm, only for a time. Let not the reader ſuppoſe I mean to laugh at this diſtinction. The beſt and the ableſt men now and then fall into what appears an abſurdity, but they always get out; not by the arguments of other people, for they know them beforehand, but by being left to themſelves they inquire after truth; whereas, when improperly oppoſed, they are too apt to think that their only buſineſs is to defend themſelves at all events. Something of this kind muſt, I think, have ſuggeſted this notion to the worthy gentleman who holds this opinion. However, it is not a queſtion worth quarrelling about, for the true friend of vaccination will be no more angry with another for vaccinating the hand, than for uſing his left hand inſtead of his right.

However, if we were to admit that ſome inſtances have occurred of Small-pox after Cow-pox, I ſhall ſhow that this is really no objection againſt the practice. There are three ways in which this may happen:

Firſt, By an imperfect vaccination.

Secondly, By the conſtitution being under the influence of ſome other diſeaſe at the time of vaccination *.

* These instances are well known to medical people. See Medical Journal, vol. xii. p. 97.

And, laſtly, By the perſon being liable to the Small-pox twice.

This laſt ſeems very ſtrange to thoſe who ſuppose that there are rules which admit of no exceptions. But it is well known that ſome people never take the Small-pox at all; and it is equally certain that ſome few, happily very few, have it twice. I know ſome ſay, this was never thought of till the Cow-pox made its appearance; but the following quotation is from a book publiſhed before vaccination was practiced.

"It is a law with moſt morbid poiſons, that a conſtitution that has once gone through the action excited by them is no longer ſuſceptible of it. This is the case, with very *few exceptions*, in the *Small-pox*. I ſay with very *few exceptions*, becauſe ſome caſes to the contrary have been ſo well authenticated, that I am not ſceptical enough to doubt that the ſuſceptibility may be ſo ſtrong in ſome particular conſtitutions as to *admit of the diſeaſe a ſecond time after a certain period*." —See Obſervations on Morbid Poiſons, publiſhed by Johnſon, 8vo. 1795.

Thus you ſee, as Small-pox is expected ſometimes to occur twice, there is no wonder if it has alſo appeared after Cow-pox. But moſt of theſe caſes have been found on inquiry not to be the genuine diſeaſe. This has made ſome people ſay, "If it is ſo difficult to know the genuine Cow-pox, is it not better to uſe the

Small-pox, which is better underſtood?" But the truth is, the Cow-pox is much more eaſily underſtood than the Small-pox, becauſe being a milder diſeaſe it is much more regular in its appearance; whereas the Small-pox, from its violence, aſſumes ſo many ſhapes, that, unleſs by the period of the fever, we cannot always aſcertain from the arm, whether the patient is ſafe or not; and even the ableſt practitioners have been obliged to acknowledge their doubts and miſtakes.

But it is beſt to give a few inſtances. Baron Dimſdale, who had the honour to inoculate the late Empreſs of Ruſſia, and was ennobled by her, mentions whole diſtricts which were inoculated with Chicken-pox, inſtead of Small-pox; and the error was never diſcovered till the Small-pox occurred, and all the inoculated were found to take the diſeaſe. In Denmark, the firſt inoculation of ſuppoſed Small-pox was Chicken-pox, and the ſame conſequences happened. The following caſe ſhews that a very ſkilful practitioner may be miſtaken in the Small-pox; and what is more, that he may be honeſt enough to own it. The caſe was publiſhed by the London College of Phyſicians, as long ago as the year 1785.

"Laſt ſpring I inoculated two children in one family. On the third day there was a ſlight inflammation around the places of inciſion. On the fifth, it was conſiderably increaſed; and the places felt hard, upon

being preſſed by the finger. I ſaw them again on the ſeventh or eighth day; and then the inflammation was much increaſed, extending nearly to the breadth of half a crown. Upon my applying a gentle preſſure to the inoculated places, matter iſſued out of them; with which, as it iſſued from the arms of both patients, I perfectly ſaturated a cotton thread. With this thread I inoculated nineteen perſons, by firſt making a ſlight inciſion in their arms with a clean lancet, and then applying a ſmall piece of the cotton thread, and a plaſter to retain it upon the place, as is uſual. Every one of theſe had a fever, and eruption of puſtules, at a proper time. But the children from whom the matter was taken did not ſicken as was expected: and, on the eleventh day, the inflammation upon their arms was conſiderably abated; and, two or three days after this, there remained nothing but a dry ſcab. Agreeably to the general opinion of the Faculty, I told the parents, that their children were ſecure from future infection of the Small-pox. They, however, inſiſted upon their being inoculated again; which was accordingly done, in the arm of each. Contrary to my expectations, their arms began again to be inflamed, and went on in the ſame manner as they had done before, till about the ninth or tenth day; when they ſickened, had a ſmart fever for three days, and then an

eruption of a conſiderable number of variolous puſtules.

"This I aver to be true; how ill ſoever it may agree with any pre-conceived theory concerning infection; and the ignorance of what is obviouſly deducible from this fact, has, ſometimes, brought a diſcredit upon Inoculation. For I know that there have been ſome inſtances, where the inoculator, from the *appearance* upon the arm *only*, has pronounced his patients ſafe from any future attack of the Small-pox; and yet, ſome years afterwards, they have taken that diſeaſe in the natural way.

"Sedbergh, 19th December, 1772.

"P. S. At a proper time, I make no doubt but that theſe two children might have been inoculated *from themſelves*."

It appears probable that these children did not ſufficiently take the Small-pox the first time; and if ſuch a gentleman as this was miſtaken in a diſeaſe which he muſt have known all his life time, no wonder if in the beginning of Vaccination ſome errors ſhould have been committed. None of the caſes, however, vaccinated by Dr. Jenner have failed, numerous as they certainly must be; and this is the leſs remarkable, becauſe from his longer acquaintance with the ſubject he was not likely to miſtake the appearance. Another remark I

would make from this caſe is, that it is very plain that those few caſes in which a puſtule was raiſed by inoculation of Small-pox after Cow-pox, were of the same nature as the first that appeared in theſe children, and is ſuch as may happen at any time to a perſon who has gone through the Small-pox or Cow-pox.

The hiſtories of perſons who have had Small-pox after inoculation for that diſeaſe, are ſo numerous, that I doubt not moſt of them reſt upon much the ſame authority as thoſe which are reported after Vaccination. However, among the number ſome are well founded in both; and probably about the ſame proportion. The following case was recorded when the friends of inoculation were particularly zealous in enquiring into the force of every objection, and its evidence is supported by the most respectable authority.

Dr. Deering's "*Account of the improved method of treating the Small-pox, published in* 1737," contains a ſtriking fact, which has never been contradicted. He says, "I have with pleasure read the ſeveral accounts of the progreſs and happy ſucceſs of inoculation: but when I heard of ſome who had been inoculated in vain, no eruption enſuing; when I *was an eye-witneſs of the inoculation of a little boy* *, *who notwithstanding the*

* This boy was the son of Dr. Croft, and inoculated by Dr. Steigerthal, physician in ordinary to King George the First.—See Woodville.

great care there was taken in the choice of the pus, had the confluent kind ſeverely, and twelve months after had them naturally, and the favourable ſort, yet was very full; when I met with many, and among them three in one family, miſerably ſeamed and pitted; when it was known in ſeveral parts of London that ſome of the inoculated perſons had loſt their lives; I could not help fearing theſe things might do that method harm, as they contradicted the ſanguine promiſes of ſome of the favourers of that operation."

But, perhaps, it will be ſaid, if the Small-pox happens after inoculation for the Small-pox, and after the Cow-pox alſo, will it not be better to take the diſeaſe in the natural way, and make ourſelves ſure?—If there was any greater ſecurity in the natural way there might be ſome reaſon in this argument, but it will be found upon inquiry, that this is not the caſe, for ſome families are ſo very liable to Small-pox, that the greater part will have it ſeverely, and ſome twice over; whilſt other families are ſo little ſuſceptible, that moſt of them will have it ſlightly, and ſome will not take it at all, either by inoculation or expoſure. The following caſe of Small-pox in the natural way twice, ſtands on ſuch good authority, that I ſhall think it enough to tranſcribe it without troubling the reader with any others. It is extracted from the Memoirs of the London

Medical Society, and has been inſerted in the Pariſh regiſter.

HISTORY OF A SECOND SMALL-POX;

By EDWARD WITHERS, *Surgeon, Newbury, Berkshire, and* C. M. S.

"Mr. Richard Langford, a Farmer of West Shefford, in this county, about fifty years of age, when about a month old had the Small-pox, at a time when three others of the family underwent the same diſeaſe, one of whom, a ſervant man, died with it. Mr. Langford's face being remarkably pitted and ſeamed, ſo as to attract the notice of all who ſaw him, no one could entertain a doubt about his having had that diſeaſe in the moſt inveterate manner; moreover, it was uſual for him alſo, whenever the Small-pox happened among the poor of his parish, to attend and aſſiſt in accommodating them with all neceſſaries.

"On the 8th of May, 1775, I was deſired to viſit this perſon. I ſaw him again early on the morning of the 10th, when his fever was ſomewhat abated. The ſucceeding day I found him ſtill better, but complaining of a raſh, which the family then informed me they had perceived very early the morning before, but

which they forgot to mention to me, and which had eſcaped *my* notice, his chamber being a very dark one.

"On examining this eruption, its appearance ſo much reſembled the Small-pox, that I told the family I ſhould not have heſitated in pronouncing it to be ſo, if his having had that diſtemper had not been ſo notorious. The next day the eruption was univerſal; his throat alſo, which he had complained of the day before, was now become more troubleſome, and indeed, every other appearance ſo much favoured the idea of the diſeaſe being variolous, as to induce me to give the moſt decided opinion of its being ſo, and to deſire that there might be no communication or intercourſe with any of his friends who had not had that diſeaſe. This opinion was ridiculed, and conſequently but little attention paid to the precaution. In the progreſs of this caſe, the advancement of the puſtules, the ſwelling of the face and head, and that ſmell peculiar to the diſeaſe, as well as every other circumſtance, ſtill more and more confirmed me in the opinion I had given.

"Reflecting on the ſingularity of the caſe, I deſired, on the eighth day from the invaſion, that a phyſician might viſit him; accordingly Dr. Collet, then a reſident in this place, was deſired to ſee him. Conſidering how neceſſary it was that the nature of this caſe

ſhould be inveſtigated in the fulleſt manner, I requeſted Dr. Hulbert, a phyſician of eminence here, would attend with Dr. Collet, on my own account. This meaſure appeared to me the more neceſſary, as the whole neighbourhood held my opinion in contempt; even Dr. Hulbert, to whom the patient was well known, laughed at my idea of its being the Small-pox. However both thoſe gentlemen, on viſiting the patient, pronounced it to be ſo. As the patient himſelf never could be reconciled to the opinion of his caſe being Small-pox, he was diſinclined to purſue the means recommended. Under theſe diſadvantages, he had but an indifferent chance of recovery from a bad confluent diſtemper; he died on the twenty-firſt day from the ſeizure.

"Four of the family, as alſo a ſiſter of the patient, to whom the diſeaſe was conveyed by her ſon's viſiting his uncle, falling down with the Small-pox, fully ſatisfied the country with regard to the nature of the diſeaſe, which nothing ſhort of this would have done: the ſiſter died.

"This caſe was thought ſo extraordinary a one as to induce the Rector of the pariſh to record the particulars of it in the pariſh regiſter.

"EDWARD WITHERS.

"*Newbury, March* 20, 1791."

Though we are apt to be ſurpriſed at theſe events, yet in reality they are not more remarkable than a white negro, or a cow with two heads, which every body has ſeen or heard of. But a man with the Small-pox a ſecond time is not ſhown at Bartholomew Fair, therefore few people know any thing about the matter.

Let us now attend to the laſt charge, that Cow-pox inoculates humours. By this I ſuppoſe is meant, that children are ſubject to breakings-out after it. Children are certainly ſubject to breakings-out, whether vaccinated or not. The ſame objection we have ſeen ſtarted againſt inoculation for Small-pox, and with more reaſon; becauſe when the inoculated Small-pox is violent, which is now and then the caſe, it may do the ſame miſchief as the natural Small-pox, which is often followed with very terrible diſeaſes. This, therefore, is not the fault of inoculation, but of the diſeaſe: as a proof of this take the following hiſtory, related by Mr. Baker, and publiſhed by the Medical Society of London.

"The following diſmal caſe is the third of diſeaſed joints after the *natural Small-pox* which has come within my knowledge; and which I beg the Society's permiſſion to lay before them.

"Edward Hughes, born in the workhouſe of St. Bride, a healthy fine child till the age of rather more

than five months, when he was ſeized with the natural Small-pox. The puſtules were few, large, and full of matter, and were every where perfectly dried off by the ninth day, about which time the left elbow became inflamed very much; and after a few days a large ſuppuration took place in the cavity of the joint, which ſeemed, from the quantity of matter, to have perfectly ſeparated the natural attachment between the bones: hardly had this gone its length, but a ſimilar one took place in the other elbow, not leſs violent than the firſt —In this ſtate the child was brought to me, October 2d. Poultices of bread and milk had been applied by the direction of the gentlemen of St. Bartholomew's hoſpital, where it had been taken for advice. It had then conſiderable ſymptomatic fever; ſaline, and gently opening medicines were now given, and the poultices continued.

"About the 10th of October the tumor on the left elbow broke, and diſcharged a great quantity of ſmooth well-digeſted pus; and left the bones ſo completely ſeparated, that the fore-arm might have been twiſted round; and ſeemed almoſt in danger of being torn off by accident, from the total loſs of ſubſtance, except diſeaſed ſkin, and cellular membrane, which were very looſe and flaccid, from the previous tumefaction. Scarce had the miſchief began in the right elbow, be-

fore ſimilar inflammation appeared in both knees, and in each wriſt. The ſufferings of the poor little object are not to be deſcribed: it gradually languiſhed in this miſerable ſtate till October 17th, when it died, aged about ſeven months."

Here you ſee the dreadful effects of three caſes of natural Small-pox, ſo that in this caſe, Inoculation could have nothing to do with the diſeaſe that followed. But what have we heard of Cow-pox? Doubtleſs that ſome children have had breakings-out after it, and that others have been cured of their breakings-out by it*. But where do theſe breakings out come from? Is it from the cow, or from the perſon from whom the matter is taken? If from the perſon, we are not likely to fare better from Small-pox inoculation. Is it then from the cow? Let us for a moment recollect who are the people that are moſt ſubject to Cow-pox, in whom the diſcovery was firſt made, and who receive it, though with leſs violence, ſometimes two or three times in their life. Theſe are the healthy, plump, Engliſh dairy maids! celebrated through the world for their roſy cheeks, their ſleek arms, and ſtout conſtitutions. This I think muſt be enough to do away all this ſtrange nonſenſe about the danger of inoculating humours from an animal whoſe milk makes the prin-

* See Medical Journal, vol. xii. p. 97.

cipal part of our childrens' food, whoſe fleſh is the ſource of Old Engliſh courage, and whoſe breath is not only fragrant, but ſalubrious.

I have now ſaid enough, I hope, to ſhow how unfounded theſe prejudices are. But I cannot conclude without a few other remarks. It has been ſaid by ſome of the beſt of people, that it is every one's duty to inoculate for the Small-pox, becauſe by it the child is ſaved from a ſeverer diſeaſe. This was very proper before a better method was known. But now it becomes every one's duty, not only to think of their own, but every other perſon's children: *To do as they would be done by.* Now, it is well known, that whoever is vaccinated, not only is equally ſafe from the Small-pox, much ſafer from humours than if inoculated with Small-pox, but alſo that he cannot convey the diſeaſe to another. Whereas by inoculation for Small-pox, a whole town may be infected, and numbers carried off before they are aware of the cauſe. For your own ſakes, therefore, for the ſake of others, and keeping in view a Chriſtian command, I truſt you will perſuade every one to relinquiſh a practice which has nothing to plead in its favour, and adopt another against which nothing can be ſaid.

APPENDIX.

In the courſe of the work it has been mentioned, that caſes of Small-pox, after Inoculation for that diſeaſe, have occurred, and been remarked before the Cow-pox was known. The following are inſerted merely becauſe the events being recent, or the parties well known, any one may ſatisfy himſelf of the particulars.

No. I.

[Copy of a Letter from the Earl of Weſtmeath.]

Sir,

Underſtanding that a report has been induſtriouſly circulated, which, if believed, would tend much to weaken that confidence which is at preſent ſo generally and ſo juſtly entertained by the public, in your ſyſtem of Inoculation for the Cow-pox; namely, that my youngeſt ſon had taken the natural Small-pox after having been vaccinated; I think it but juſtice to

you to contradict the report, and to ſtate for your ſatisfaction the real circumſtances of the caſe, which are as follow:

When he was about two months old, he was Inoculated for the *Small-pox* in the Suttonian method, by a phyſician in Ireland, who has been very generally ſucceſsful in Inoculation, and pronounced by him to be entirely free from the riſk of infection; notwithſtanding which he caught the infection about a fortnight ſince, and is now recovering from the *natural Small-pox*.

I beg to inform you at the ſame time, that my youngeſt daughter, who was vaccinated by you about four years ſince, has not only been frequently expoſed to the danger of infection, but was actually inoculated for the *Small-pox* without taking it. I have conſidered it incumbent upon me to bear this teſtimony to the efficacy of the Vaccine ſyſtem, as I conſider the report relative to my ſon, that originated in miſrepreſentation, to have been circulated for purpoſes obviouſly prejudicial to that moſt uſeful and fortunate diſcovery.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient humble ſervant,

(Copy) WESTMEATH.

To Dr. Jenner.

No. II.

Miss Price, niece of Mr. Whitebrook, Wine-Cooper, in Greek-ſtreet, Soho, was inoculated when an infant for the Small-pox, by the late Dr. Barwis, of Devizes, in Wiltſhire, at the time of a general variolous inoculation in that town. She had the diſeaſe ſatisfactorily, ſome marks of which are ſtill viſible on her face. About five weeks ago ſhe ſickened, and had a pretty full eruption of the natural Small-pox of the diſtinct kind, and is now juſt recovered from it; her mother attended her, and from the recollection of her daughter's having had the Small-pox by Inoculation, could not be convinced that the laſt eruption was Small-pox, till its complete character placed the matter beyond diſpute. Upon inquiry it appeared ſhe had the Chicken-pox when a child, which removes the poſſibility of her having been inoculated through miſtake, in the firſt inſtance, for that complaint.

No. III.

Caſe of Mrs. Sydney Probert, principal Nurſe at the Fever-houſe, in Gray's-Inn-Lane:

Sydney Probert, aged 76, was inoculated at the age of about 15 years, at Ludlow, in Shropſhire, by Mr. Cole, Surgeon of that place, whoſe ſon now ſucceeds

him. She took the diſeaſe, fevered, with an eruption, to the ſatisfaction of Mr. Cole. The following year ſhe came to London, lived in ſervice, and expoſed herſelf without caution, and without inconvenience, to the Small-pox. She married, and kept the George at Enfield, where ſhe nurſed ſeven children of her own with Small-pox, without catching it.

About twenty-ſix years ago ſhe was ſeized with fever, which in the end proved Small-pox, and ſo violent, that ſhe is more ſeamed and ſcarred with the diſeaſe, than is uſually met with in the worſt caſes of that dreadful diſtemper.

No. IV.

The following caſes are annexed to ſhew the uncertainty of Vaccination when the conſtitution is under any other diſeaſe. The children had probably the Itch at the time they were vaccinated; and as the ſurgeon never viſited after he had inoculated them, he never knew whether they took the Cow-pox or not; moreover, the hiſtory is written by Dr. Clutterbuck, a gentleman of well-known reſpectability, and as yet not a warm advocate for Vaccination.

It has been publicly ſtated within theſe few days, by a profeſſional enemy of the Vaccine Inoculation *,

* Dr. Moſely.

that at the houſe of a Mrs. Mills, Sleaford-ſtreet, Batterſea-fields, (a nurſe to the poor children of St. John's pariſh, Weſtminſter) two children had within the laſt ten days died of Small-pox, who had the Cow-pox laſt ſummer; and that three other children were at this time ill of the ſame diſeaſe, in a ſevere degree, who alſo had Cow-pox laſt ſummer.

As this account will probably be laid before the public, and is certainly calculated to make a ſtrong impreſſion, I felt anxious to obtain a more minute relation of the particulars, and for this purpoſe repaired with my friend Mr. Sawrey, Surgeon to the Houſe, on Saturday laſt, the 25th inſtant. The Nurſe informed us, (Dr. Clutterbuck continues his account) that nine children under her care were inoculated for the Cow-pox laſt ſummer, by a gentleman, who at that time attended the ſick poor of the pariſh, but whoſe name ſhe does not now recollect. She ſays, that he never ſaw the children after the inoculation. She thought at the time that ſome of them took the infection, others not: but ſhe has no diſtinct recollection of the particular appearances. Three of theſe children died of the natural Small-pox within the laſt ten days; but ſhe cannot ſay whether the Inoculation left any marks on the arms; yet ſhe ſays, that ever ſince, all the children have had breakings-out to a violent degree, which ſhe attributes to the Cow-pox.

and to the children not having taken phyſic afterwards.

Upon examining the arms of the three children now under the Small-pox, I was not able to diſcover any cicatrices (ſcars, or marks from Inoculation, which continue through life). But it muſt be obſerved, that the arms, like the reſt of the body, have a conſiderable number of puſtules on them, though there is ſufficient room for the ſcars to appear, if ſituated in the interſtices. In one of them there is ſuch a general roughneſs and ſcalineſs of the ſkin, that a cicatrix, if preſent, would ſcarcely be perceived.

The remaining three children have not taken the Small-pox. Upon the arms of all theſe viſible cicatrices are left by the inoculation; in two, as ſtrongly marked as uſual; in the third, very faintly.

The breaking-out on the ſkin of theſe children, which the nurſe refers to the Cow-pox, is indubitably the Itch; very diſtinctly characterized between the fingers, and on ſome other parts, though in many places, it has degenerated into angry, ſcabby puſtules, an appearance not at all unuſual in the Itch in children. The nurſe herſelf has this diſeaſe in a great degree.

From the above account no inference can be drawn againſt Vaccination: on the contrary, imperfect as it is, it is rather in favour of the practice; for

in the three inſtances where there is any evidence of the Cow-pox having really taken place, (viz. the cicatrices remaining on the arms) the Small-pox has not occurred; whilſt in thoſe that died, and in the other three now ill of the Small-pox, it is at leaſt doubtful whether any cicatrices were left.

I confeſs that the late failures have made me ſomewhat ſceptical as to the permanency of the preventive power of Vaccination; and I have taken pains, in conſequence, to aſcertain the foundation of many of them. I need not obſerve, for it is notorious, that the greater number of the reputed failures are unfounded, and originated in ſome miſtake, either with regard to the Cow-pox, or to the ſuppoſed Small-pox afterwards. A few ſeem ſcarcely to admit of doubt; at leaſt no explanation of them has been yet given that is ſatisfactory to my mind. In ſome the circumſtances have been erroneouſly repreſented from miſinformation, and ſo have led to a concluſion the reverſe of what it ought to have been. This I apprehend has been the caſe in the inſtance related above.

(Signed) HENRY CLUTTERBUCK.

St. Paul's Church-yard,
May 29th, 1805.

Published by the Author,

1. OBSERVATIONS on MORBID POISONS, PHAGEDÆNA and CANCER, 8vo. 5*s*, Johnson.

2. A TREATISE on the CANCEROUS BREAST, consisting of Original Letters from Doctors Baillie, Babington, and Stokes; Messieurs Cline and Abernethy; with Answers from the Author, 8vo. 3*s*. Longman.

R. Wilks, Printer, Chancery Lane.